UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,394	04/26/2000	TOMAS EDSTROM	SUNDS-112	5653

530 7590 03/03/2004

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER	
PARADISO, JOHN ROGER	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3721	23

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/530,394	EDSTROM, TOMAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R. Paradiso	3721	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *6 and 10-24*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

Rinaldi I. Rada
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700

EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive.

On page 2 of his Response, Applicant argues that "None of the cited references recognizes or addresses the problem of wire jamming in the feeding wheel of an apparatus..." However,the claims do not recite anti-jamming methods or apparatus, but rather measuring means, and the three teaching references do show measuring means that, in combination with JONSSON, do fulfill the limitations of the claims. Applicant further argues that none of the cited references recognizes "the solution of providing a measuring means separate from the feeding wheel." However, all of the cited references show a measuring wheel, as explained in detail in the previous Office Action. However, each of MATHEY, NELSON ET AL, or PETERSEN disclose the teaching of a separaate measuring device (as described in the previous Office Action) in order to more effectively determine the amount of binding material needed and used. Regarding the motivation to use these teachings, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, while the combination of JONSSON with the separate measuring devices of the three teaching references are not motivated by jamming of the wire, they are motivated by a desire to more effectively measure the wire, which is also reasonably pertinent to the Applicant's aims and goals.

On page 3 of His Response, Applicant argues that "Jonsson clearly indicates that the measurement means 33 is located at the in-feed wheel, and not spearted from the feed wheel. The only teaching to provide measuring means separate from a feed wheel appears in the Applicant's specification." The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, each of the teaching references do disclose the teaching of a separaate measuring device (as described in the previous Office Action) in order to more effectively determine the amount of binding material needed and used, as explained above.